

### Remarks

Claims 1-2, 4-13, 15-32, 34-50, and 52-55 are pending. Claims 1-2, 4-13, 15-32, 34-50, and 52-55 are rejected. Claims 2, 13, and 32 are cancelled without prejudice by this Response. Claims 1, 12, 15, and 31 are amended by this Response. The Applicants respectfully requests allowance of claims 1, 4-12, 15-31, 34-50, and 52-55.

### Drawings

The Applicants have included corrected drawings with this Response as requested by the Examiner.

### § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-2, 4-13, 15-32, 34-50, and 52-55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0017861 (Allen). The Applicants cancelled claims 2, 13, and 32. The Applicants submit that claims 1, 4-12, 15-31, 34-50, and 52-55 are novel over Allen.

In the rejection provided in the Office action, the Examiner submits that Allen teaches the signaling processor provided in the claims, such as claim 1. Claim 1 provides “*a signaling processor adapted to receive and to process the call signaling to select an ATM connection for the user communications and to transmit a control message identifying the selected ATM connection*”. Allen does not teach a signaling processor as provided in claim 1.


To support the rejection of the signaling processor, the Examiner cites to item 30 in Allen. Item 30 in Allen is a centralized control and signaling interworking function device (CS-IWF). The CS-IWF described in Allen converts a narrowband signaling protocol to a broadband signaling protocol used by the ATM switching network (26). (see Allen, paragraphs 46, 70, 84-89). In other words, the CS-IWF receives and processes call signaling, converts the call signals from one protocol to another protocol, and transmits the call signaling in the other protocol to a device. The CS-IWF in Allen does not process call signaling to select an ATM connection for user communications as provided in claim 1. The CS-IWF just converts signaling between protocols and does not

select connections for user communications. Further, the CS-IWF in Allen does not transmit a control message identifying the ATM connection to an ATM matrix as provided in claim 1 to control an ATM matrix. Thus, Allen does not teach the system in claim 1.

Similar arguments apply for the other independent claims and dependent claims.

#### Conclusion

Based on the above remarks, the Applicants submit that claims 1, 4-12, 15-31, 34-50, and 52-55 are allowable over Allen. The Applicants submit that there may be additional reasons in support of patentability, but that such reasons are moot in light of the above remarks and are omitted in the interests of brevity. The Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1, 4-12, 15-31, 34-50, and 52-55.

---

**SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER**

Brett Bornsen, Reg. No. 46,566  
Duft Setter Ollila & Bornsen LLC  
Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 17  
Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

**Correspondence address:**

**CUSTOMER NO. 28004**

Attn: Harley R. Ball  
6391 Sprint Parkway  
Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100  
Overland Park, KS 66251-2100